

Second, while we place dollar caps on the credit, any contribution above that level would be tax deductible as it is now. Similarly, contributions to other nonprofits would also retain their present deductibility.

In closing, we believe that if our bill was enacted, we could at once reduce Federal spending and micromanagement, create competition among aid providers, reinvigorate a charitable sector whose tremendous capacity has been subverted by government intrusion, and finally begin to attack poverty in a truly meaningful and effective way.

COMMON SENSE WELFARE REFORM ACT

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Congressman KNOLLENBERG, to introduce the Common Sense Welfare Reform Act. We believe it is not only possible, but sensible, to turn the administration of the welfare system over to the State capitals and the city halls. Block granting social programs to the States is a first step in reform of the welfare system. This flexibility is critical to allowing States to test assistance programs best suited to their needs. Common sense tells us that a successful program in rural Arizona may not necessarily work in Detroit, MI.

We believe, however, that the debate should be taken a step further—and that is why we are introducing the Common Sense Welfare Reform Act. If States can better administer welfare programs, shouldn't it follow that citizens know best which programs work in their communities and which are the most cost-effective? That's what our legislation is about—a partnership of State and local entities with individual taxpayers.

The common sense welfare reform bill will give the people that pay the bills and provide the services in the community a role in how poverty relief efforts are structured. The Common Sense Welfare Reform Act consolidates over 60 overlapping, inefficient programs run by the Federal Government and gives the money directly to the States in block grant form. That's a direction in which the House is moving and is a necessary precondition to making our welfare privatization proposal work.

Our proposal allows taxpayers to contribute up to 10 percent—not to exceed \$2,500—of their Federal income taxes to qualified private charities in their State in return for a dollar-for-dollar tax credit. This tax credit is paid for by corresponding reductions in the block grant to the State in which the taxpayer lives.

The Common Sense Welfare Reform Act serves two purposes by empowering taxpayers to participate in the funding decisions for poverty-relief services. First, we give taxpayers a voice in how services are delivered in their communities. We have faith in the ability of individuals who are in the communities to know what is working well. The Federal Government—or State governments, for that matter—should not have a monopoly on where welfare dollars are allocated. Critics of block grants contend that many States do not have a good track record in administering so-

cial programs. Our proposal, however, diffuses the concentration of authority over spending on poverty-relief efforts by leveling the playing field on which private and public charities compete. The Common Sense Welfare Reform Act allows taxpayers to determine where their poverty-relief dollars are spent the most effectively.

Second, we reward private charities for doing what they have traditionally done best, and that is to provide prompt, temporary assistance. Private charities view assistance as a tool by which to change behavior—it is not a right nor a way of life. Because of this philosophy, both in theory and in practice, it is inconceivable that a family would subsist for generations on the local soup kitchen, food bank or shelter. Private charities stress personal responsibility and provide hands-on management for recipients. The humanizing aspect of private charities is missing from the impersonal public welfare bureaucracy which requires nothing from the recipient except eligibility for aid.

Americans need to become personally involved in reforming the welfare system. If I may be so immodest, I would suggest that Congressman KNOLLENBERG and I have a bold and innovative approach in the Common Sense Welfare Reform Act to allow Americans to do just that. We hope the momentum in the welfare debate will take our deliberations a step further. Let's allow taxpayers a role in providing assistance, while giving private charities the opportunity to compete for welfare dollars in a true, competitive atmosphere, instead of making their funding a function of who has the best grant writer or the best connections in Washington—or Lansing or Tallahassee.

THE DEATH OF JAMES P. GRANT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world lost a great humanitarian this past weekend with the death of my dear friend, Jim Grant.

For the past 15 years, Jim served with distinction and compassion as the Executive Director of UNICEF. He was a man who loved all of the world's children and a man who made a significant difference. Jim Grant epitomized the dedicated international public servant, but no one ever called him a bureaucrat. Rather, he was a visionary leader who used all the tools available to promote worthy causes.

Jim Grant was a field-oriented person. No project was too remote to escape Jim's interest. Traveling with Jim in Africa meant spending a lot of time in off-road vehicles to see how well health programs were reaching remote villages.

Jim Grant was a promoter in the best sense of the word. Whether he was promoting expanded immunization programs, oral rehydration, or breastfeeding, or whether he was enlisting another celebrity as a UNICEF goodwill ambassador, Jim Grant always used his flair for publicity for good causes.

Jim Grant had the capacity to influence world leaders to focus on the topic he cared most about—the state of the world's children.

Perhaps his most satisfying accomplishment was the 1990 World Summit for Children and one of his greatest disappointments was that he did not see his own Government ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child during his lifetime.

Probably no tribute to Jim Grant's life is more appropriate than to lay out the following statistics: During his tenure as Executive Director of UNICEF, immunization levels in the developing world have risen from about 20 percent in 1980 to almost 80 percent today. During that same period, the number of polio victims has fallen from 500,000 a year to fewer than 100,000.

Jim Grant was an American hero and a world treasure. His presence will be greatly missed, but his work and the good works of UNICEF will remain a legacy of his persistence and humanity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I was, unfortunately, detained in my congressional district in Baltimore earlier today and thus forced to miss a record vote. Specifically, I was not present to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 74, on the amendment offered by Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, having been granted a leave of absence after 8 p.m. on Monday, January 30, 1995, I missed rollcall votes 64 through 71. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" in each instance.

BUDGET BALANCING VIA CONFLICT CONTAINMENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Professor Janos Horvath is one of Indiana's most distinguished citizens. His Ph.D. in economics was earned at Columbia University. He now teaches courses in advanced macroeconomics, principles of economics, international business and business ethics.

He is known and rightly known as a brilliant theoretician.

Before his immigration to the United States, he was a leader in the Hungarian independence movements in 1956. Earlier he was imprisoned by the Nazi Gestapo. He was elected to the Hungarian Parliament in 1945.

The following is an example of the imaginative writing of Dr. Horvath.